



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/723,265	11/27/2000	William R. Rohrbach	ROHRBACH 8-13	4313

47394 7590 03/14/2005

HITT GAINES, PC  
LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.  
PO BOX 832570  
RICHARDSON, TX 75083

EXAMINER

APPIAH, CHARLES NANA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2686

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/723,265	ROHRBACH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Charles Appiah	2686	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lebowitz et al.

4. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lebowitz (5,454,024)** in view of **Barringer (5,675,371)**.

Regarding claims 1, 8 and 15 Lebowitz discloses an alarm system, a method of operating an alarm system and a voice network comprising: a local transceiver (31), configured to establish, in response to a received stimulus (sensor circuitry), establishes a wireless link to a wireless central monitoring station (33-40) in the wireless voice network (32), and a local controller (16), coupled to the transceiver for bi-directional communication with the central monitoring station, (see col. 8, line 50 to col. 9, line 35), configured to receive and send commands and data from and to the wireless central monitoring station via the wireless link (see col. 5, line 41 to col. 6, line 19). Lebowitz fails to explicitly teach that the established wireless link between the local transceiver and the wireless central monitoring station uses diminished bandwidth

which is insufficient to provide commercially-acceptable quality of service standards for voice communication.

Barringer discloses a remote sensor for sensing and collecting both analog and digital information from field equipment used in the cable television industry and a Cellemetry modem for transmitting and collecting the collected analog and digital information using Cellemetry service (see Fig. 1), wherein monitored changed in status are transmitted in a message over an RF link at an 800 MHz frequency (see col. 2, lines 16-21, col. 5, lines 8-26). According to Barringer several input conditions can cause the transmission of specially formatted message over a cellular control channel (see col. 6, lines 33-45).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Barringer using out-of-band bandwidth for transmitting monitored conditions with the system of Lebowitz in order to ensure the more efficient utilization of available bandwidth for enhanced reliability as taught by Barringer.

Regarding claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 17 and 18, Lebowitz shows wherein the stimulus is an alarm event communicated from the local controller to the local transceiver and wherein the local event is selected from the group consisting of a user-triggered alarm event an intruder-triggered event (see col. 8, line 50 to col. 9, line 35).

Regarding claims 5, 12, and 19, Lebowitz further teaches wherein the stimulus is a command communicated from the wireless central station to the local transceiver (see col. 5, line 41 to col. 6, line 19).

Regarding claim 6, 13, and 20, Lebowitz further shows wherein the wireless link as established by the central monitoring station is exclusively established with the local transceiver (see col. 5, lines 41-52).

Regarding claim 7, 14 and 21, Lebowitz further shows wherein the wireless central monitoring station broadcasts the command to a plurality of transceivers and is received by the local transceiver (see Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 1-7).

4. Claims 2, 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lebowitz and Barringer** as applied to claims 1, 8 and 15 above, and further in view of **Fish (5,422,626)**.

Regarding claims 2, 9 and 16, the combination of Lebowitz and LeBlanc fail to explicitly teach wherein the local transceiver and the wireless central monitoring station exchange data in bursts.

Fish discloses a system for monitoring a location in which the monitored station uses burst signals having different repetition rates to signal a detected alarm condition which leads to power savings, reduces the possibility of false alarms and improve network performance (see col. 1, line 24 to col. 2, line 6).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the burst signal transmission and reception system of Fish to the system of Lebowitz as modified by LeBlanc in order to provide the advantages of power saving, increased reliability and the substantial reduction of false alarms as taught by Fish.

***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Joong et al. (5,937,355) discloses a method for emergency call handling in a cellular telecommunication system.

Malvaso et al. (5,717,378) discloses a security system having a communications link with a central control and local control.

Tallman et al. (WO 99/35624) discloses a security system having a monitoring station.

Hess 5,587,701) discloses a portable alarm system capable of initiating a telephone call to a remote security monitoring station using 800MHz trunking.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Appiah whose telephone number is 703 305-4772. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on 703 305-4379. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CA

  
CHARLES APPIAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER